



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

City Council Chamber
200 Old Bernal Avenue, Pleasanton, CA 94566

APPROVED

Special Meeting

Wednesday, October 22, 2008

(Staff has reviewed the proposed changes against the recorded proceedings and confirms that these Minutes are accurate.)

CALL TO ORDER

The Planning Commission Special Meeting of October 22, 2008, was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chair Blank.

1. ROLL CALL

Staff Members Present: Brian Dolan, Director of Planning and Community Development; Steven Bocian, Assistant City Manager; Michael Roush, City Attorney; Mike Tassano, City Traffic Engineer; Robin Giffin, Associate Planner; and Maria L. Hoey, Recording Secretary

Commissioners Present: Commissioners Phil Blank, Kathy Narum, Greg O'Connor, Arne Olson, and Jennifer Pearce

Commissioners Absent: Commissioner Anne Fox

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Chair Blank advised that because this is a special meeting, the public can comment only on items on the Agenda and that City Attorney Roush will provide further explanation.

City Attorney Roush stated that the Brown Act provides members of the public an opportunity to speak on items that are not on the agenda but are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the legislative body conducting the meeting. He added that by contrast, the Brown Act also provides that only items on a Special Meeting Agenda

can be discussed at that Special Meeting. He explained that this section has been interpreted to mean that there is not an opportunity at Special Meetings for the typical public comment on items not on the agenda. He noted that anyone who wishes to comment on those items may provide public comment at the Commission's next regular meeting on October 29, 2008.

3. PUBLIC HEARINGS AND OTHER MATTERS

PSP-11 and PRZ-44, Stoneridge Drive Specific Plan Amendment/Staples Ranch Project, Corresponding Environmental Impact Report (EIR), and Planned Unit Development (PUD) Rezoning/Prezoning for Staples Ranch

The proposed 124-acre Staples Ranch development would include an approximately 37-acre auto mall to accommodate the relocation of the Pleasanton Auto Mall, a 46-acre senior continuing care community with a health center, an 11-acre commercial/retail development, a 17-acre community park, and a 5-acre neighborhood park that includes a storm water flow control basin. Access to the auto mall and future commercial development would be from a new road off El Charro Road with no through connection to Stoneridge Drive except for emergency vehicles. A new two-lane bridge would extend Stoneridge Drive over the Arroyo Mocho and provide access to the proposed senior continuing care community and parks.

The project site is located at the southwest corner of the I-580 and El Charro Road intersection. Approximately 1.5 acres of the property is located in Pleasanton and is zoned PUD-MDR (Planned Unit Development – Medium Density Residential), and approximately 122.5 acres are located in unincorporated Alameda County. The site would be rezoned/pre-zoned to the following PUD districts: PUD-C (Commercial), PUD-HDR/C (High Density Residential/Commercial), PUD-P (Park), PUD-MDR (Medium Density Residential), or some similar combination of PUD zoning.

Mr. Bocian stated that there were three matters before the Planning Commission this evening. He noted that he will present the first two items, which are the Draft Stoneridge Drive Specific Plan Amendment for the Staples Ranch Project and the Rezoning/Pre-Zoning of Staples Ranch, and Rodney Jeung, project manager at PBS&J and Environmental Impact Report (EIR) consultant, will handle the third item, which is the EIR.

Mr. Bocian stated that the Staples Ranch project is viewed as a stand-alone document that builds on the Stoneridge Drive Specific Plan (SDSP) adopted in 1989. He noted that the entire SDSP area, except the Staples Ranch area, has been developed under the 1989 Plan. He stated that the guiding documents for this project include the Stoneridge Drive Specific Plan, the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) which was entered into between the City of Pleasanton and Alameda County Surplus Property Authority in April 2006 and which set forth a roadmap for project review. He noted that in 2007, Alameda County Surplus Property Authority, City of Livermore, City of Pleasanton, and Vulcan Materials entered into a Pre-development and Cooperation Agreement regarding the design,

access, and construction of El Charro Road; and the City entered into a Cost-Sharing Agreement with the City of Livermore and Alameda County for flood control improvements and cost-sharing for the construction of El Charro Road.

Mr. Bocian continued that in 1993, the County adopted the Airport Protection Area which is incorporated in the City's General Plan and reflected in the Specific Plan. He added that there is also a State law that sets forth the purpose of the Specific Plan and noted that additional projects and specific conditions of approval can be added during the PUD process, which will begin at some point in the near future.

Mr. Bocian then displayed a PowerPoint presentation on the Stoneridge Drive Specific Plan Area, the Amended Stoneridge Drive Specific Plan Primary Area, surrounding land uses, and the Amended Specific Plan Land Uses. He indicated that the proposed Staples Ranch development would include a 37-acre auto mall to accommodate the relocation of the Pleasanton Auto Mall (Hendrick); a 46-acre senior continuing care retirement community with a health center (Continuing Life Communities [CLC]); an 11-acre commercial/retail development (Fremont Land); a 17-acre community park; a 5-acre neighborhood park that includes a hydromodification storm water control basin; and roadway improvements.

He presented sample design standards for the Auto Mall which will provide a landscape buffer of trees between the Neighborhood Park and CLC; limit freeway signs to 48 feet; provide vehicle access from Auto Mall Place with shared emergency vehicle access (EVA) to CLC; install six-foot wide separated sidewalks on Auto Mall Place; and have a maximum area of 331,000 square feet and maximum building height of 45 feet. He then presented a Landscape Buffer Concept by CLC and Auto Mall and noted that the buffer will vary between 20 and 25 feet with the combination of evergreen trees, shrubs, vegetation swales, and a wall.

Mr. Bocian also presented sample design standards for the Retail/Commercial (Fremont Land) site which will include outdoor pedestrian amenities such as plazas, benches, tables, arts; limit non-EVA vehicular access to Auto Mall Place; provide landscape buffer with community park; provide connection points to trails, pathways with the community park; and provide emergency-only access on El Charro Road.

He further presented sample design standards for CLC which will limit building height to 50 feet four stories; provide gated emergency access on Staples Ranch Road; provide landscaped berm along I-580; provide six foot sidewalks along Stoneridge Drive; and provide adequate parking for residents and visitors.

He then presented a landscape buffer—berm concept and sample Circulation Policies, which provide a variety of pedestrian access including six foot separated sidewalks; an EVA with automated gate; landscaping on Stoneridge Drive and Auto Mall Place continues existing planting palette; public transit is not currently served, but bus stops are planned; access to the auto mall and future commercial from Auto

Mall Place; a new two-lane bridge would extend Stoneridge Drive over the Arroyo Mocho and provide access to the proposed senior continuing care community and parks; and no through-connection from Stoneridge Drive to Auto Mall Place and El Charro Road except for emergency vehicles.

He presented a depiction of the EVA, showing gates and bollards and separated sidewalks. He noted that the amended Specific Plan also has policies related to both parks. He added that the City Council recently approved a Conceptual Park Master Plan which is primarily for the Community Park but has elements that will be brought into the Neighborhood Park, including the recommendation for an Ice Center; Public Services and Utilities – water, energy, flood control, storm water; Environmental Impact and Mitigation measures – recognizes the EIR; and implementation – infrastructure phasing, financing public improvements, and developer/Alameda County Surplus Property Authority responsibilities.

Mr. Bocian then discussed the proposed rezoning and pre-zoning issues, stating that the Continuing Care Retirement facility is being proposed for High Density Residential/Commercial, the Auto Mall as PUD-Commercial, and Retail as PUD-Commercial. He pointed out that the rezoning is currently PUD-Medium Density Residential but is actually part of the CLC property so it would be rezoned to PUD-Commercial. He noted that there is an existing strip of 19 feet which will be transferred to property owners and which will be PUD-Medium Density Residential, which is the current zoning.

Mr. Bocian then introduced Mr. Mike Tassano, City Traffic Engineer, and asked the Commissioners if they had any questions. There being none, Mr. Bocian turned the floor over to Mr. Rodney Jeung.

Rodney Jeung, PBS&J, noted that the certification action to be taken by the City Council and the recommendation by the Planning Commission are not the same as project approval. He stated that the Commission can find that the EIR satisfies and meets all of the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and still reject the project. He explained that “certification” means the City has complied with the CEQA and various State guidelines, that the City has received all information necessary to understand the potential impacts associated with approving the project, and that the City has exercised its own independent judgment regarding the analysis of the project.

Mr. Jeung noted that after the Draft EIR was released, the planning activities continued, and there were several changes to the project description that was previously presented in the Draft EIR. He stated that these changes involved components related to the emergency access, the conceptual park master plan, boundary modifications, and a revision as to how the El Charro Road Auto Mall Place intersection would be constructed and configured. He stated that the changes to the project description do not constitute any new environmental effects or things already identified in the EIR; they are normal changes, modifications that evolved

through the planning process. He added that once the City had reported those changes to them, they included them in the EIR, did an assessment, and found none of them represented anything new in terms of a potential impact.

Mr. Jeung continued that with respect to the public review, there were 23 different comments letters received; approximately 12 came from public agencies, 5 came from various organizations, and the balance from members of the public. He noted that there were a total of approximately 200 comments received.

Mr. Jeung noted that it is their obligation to prepare responses to substantive comments regarding the EIR. He added that there were three different types of responses: the first includes those that clarify and explain information contained in the EIR, such as responses to questions from CalTrans and the City of Dublin asking for explanation regarding the potential extension of Stoneridge Drive through the project area and about potential intersection impacts to the cities of Dublin and Livermore.

He stated that the second type of responses includes those that acknowledge opinions or preferences and project merits. He noted that many were received that supported the project, and they had supplied comments about specific things they would like for the project.

He noted the third type of responses as those relating to corrections or amendments to the text, such as the information provided by Zone 7 about the proper name for the Las Positas widening. He noted that specific text changes were made for accuracy but did not change the analysis.

Mr. Jeung stated that he believes the responses in the revisions confirm the analysis presented in the EIR and that the changes, comments, and responses did not result in substantive changes in terms of analysis, significant impact, and the mitigation measures that were warranted.

Mr. Jeung stated that if the City agrees that the document satisfies the CEQA requirements, the City Council can take action to certify the document. He added that at that point, there is an opportunity to advance to deliberations on the project or a variation. He stated that he believes staff will recommend the Ice Center alternative, which was discussed in the EIR. He noted that the EIR identifies certain unavoidable impacts, and if the City elects to move forward with the project knowing there will be impacts, the City must issue a Statement of Overriding Considerations, which is a statement that says in weighing the significant impacts against the community benefits, it believes the benefits outweigh those impacts.

Mr. Jeung added that as part of project approval, there is also a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, which basically takes all mitigation measures identified in the EIR and specifies who is responsible for their implementation and when those measure should be implemented. He noted that the document basically

gives the community a sense of the mitigation measures that have been identified to reduce those impacts to less than a significant level and that are in fact going to be implemented. He concluded that following project approval, a Notice of Determination is posted, which starts a 30-day statute of limitations.

Commissioner Olson asked Mr. Jeung if the subject matter of the comments, opinions, and preferences collected were tracked, and if so, if the number that argued that the Stoneridge Drive extension should be included in the Specific Plan was tracked. Mr. Jeung replied that they did track comments that expressed that preference but that he did not bring a tally. He noted that the point made in their response was that the project as proposed does not include an extension of Stoneridge Drive and that the extension can occur in the future, consistent with the Pleasanton General Plan.

Commissioner Olson noted that the Statement of Overriding Considerations considers social and economic considerations and that the economic side was a bit sparse. He stated that his view on the project is that there are solid economic reasons why those economic considerations are important, particularly if the City looks at sustainability and buildout in the Pleasanton community.

Mr. Jeung referred the question to staff. Mr. Roush replied that the Statement of Overriding Considerations was standard, based on what staff has identified, but not intended to be definitive. He noted that it is ultimately up to the City Council, who makes the decision regarding whether or not to approve the project, to indicate what it finds are the social and economic benefits. He indicated that staff would appreciate any other items the Commission feels should be included in order to take it forward to the City Council.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED.

Ineda Adesanya, Alameda County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo) planner, informed the Commission that LAFCo is still working on reviewing the EIR, noting that LAFCo is not satisfied the EIR will be sufficient for future annexation. She noted two areas of concern: the level of analysis given on the actual extension of Stoneridge Drive; and a glitch in regard to primary agricultural soils where Cortese-Knox requirements for designating prime agricultural soils is different from that of the State Lands Commission. She indicated that the County has about 72 acres which is acknowledged in the EIR, but LAFCo must decide what they should do when Cortese-Knox identifies mitigation. She noted that they in fact do not have policies in place for mitigation for designated prime agricultural land, not because they have never been used but that they have always been planned for non-agricultural issues, and that they are trying to work through this.

Commissioner Olson inquired what part of analysis LAFCo would be looking for with regard to further study of a Stoneridge Drive extension.

Ms. Adesanya stated that LAFCo received some information today that they may be able to consider, but because the Draft EIR refers to the traffic study as opposed to doing analysis within the document, it presents a problem if that study or the results of that study would have been included in the analysis as an alternative.

Commissioner Olson inquired if it was an inclusionary issue, and Ms. Adesanya replied that this is the way she sees it now.

Chair Blank asked Ms. Adesanya if she meant that even though the MOU does not contemplate the extension of Stoneridge Drive, the analysis should be included. Ms. Adesanya said yes.

Patrick James inquired what would prevent the gate that blocks Stoneridge Drive from opening through for future development. He indicated that he could see future Councilmembers or Planning Commissioners having the ability to open it to through-traffic. He also inquired why the retirement community was not sited to completely block through-access on Stoneridge Drive through to El Charro Drive.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Chair Blank asked staff if a copy of the MOU was available because in its present state, it did not specifically state that the Stoneridge Drive extension should go through immediately. He inquired if the decision was made not to include it.

Mr. Bocian replied that the MOU contemplates there will be an EVA and a reservation of right-of-way. He added that this is how the project is designed and reflected in the project description.

Chair Blank inquired if a new EIR would be required if a new Planning Commission or new City Council wanted to open up Stoneridge Drive.

Mr. Bocian replied that he did not believe there would be a new EIR but that supplemental work would need to be done, with an opportunity for public comment at that time.

Chair Blank inquired if this would be done as part of a PUD, and Mr. Roush replied that it would most likely be a Specific Plan Amendment. He added that in conjunction with that, there would most likely be a supplemental EIR that would look at traffic impacts at that time if the extension were opened.

In response to Mr. Patrick's question regarding what would prevent the City from ultimately opening up the EVA, Mr. Bocian stated that the extension of the road is part of the General Plan and that if the Council wanted to extend the roadway, it would most likely require an amendment to the Specific Plan and some supplemental work on the EIR.

Chair Blank stated that he believed that the gate would be more secure than those infrared sensors one could purchase on EBay. Mr. Bocian stated that the gate is designed to withhold any force to push the gate open and drive through. He noted that the graphic shows that there are bollards on both sides of the gate to restrict traffic so people cannot drive across the lawn. He noted that the gate would most likely mirror some of the Opticon gates the City has in place.

Commissioner Olson inquired if there were any possibility for the City and the County to decide to change the MOU. Mr. Bocian replied that this could be done. Mr. Roush explained that if there were a decision made to extend Stoneridge Drive at this time with respect to the first phase of the project, the project description would need to be changed, additional environmental work would have to be done before the EIR could be certified, and the MOU would technically have to be changed as well. He added that all this could be accomplished.

Commissioner Pearce inquired what the potential impact might be should LAFCo determine that the EIR in its current form is inadequate and if this impact would prevent the project from moving forward. Mr. Roush replied that if LAFCo were to decide that it could not approve the annexation, it would have to indicate and make findings as to why it could not do that. He continued that the City or applicant could then either go back and revise what LAFCo needed to be added to be acceptable, or challenge LAFCo and seek to overturn that decision in court on the grounds that its decision was arbitrary.

Commissioner Pearce inquired if, should the City decides to revise the EIR to accommodate LAFCo's requirements, the EIR would return to the Planning Commission. Mr. Roush replied that it would most likely return because there would be a change in the project description or some other aspect for environmental work.

Commissioner Pearce inquired if it is the City's recommendation that the Commission make a recommendation one way or the other with respect to the EIR. Mr. Roush replied that it is.

Commissioner Pearce asked Mr. Tassano what the traffic impact of the ice center alternative would be and why it did not account for what seems a likely scenario of people pulling into the smaller parking lot more than 10 percent, driving around and not finding parking, going back out to the freeway, and coming back around El Charro Road. She inquired what potential alternative staff would propose should this scenario become likely.

Mr. Tassano noted that Commissioner Pearce had asked in an email whether the traffic study contemplated this additional traffic going back down Stoneridge Drive as an exit, thereby generating double traffic. He replied that staff looked at what it anticipated would be the most likely traffic disbursement and was comfortable with that 10 percent. He noted that there could be times where there is a heavier influx coming to Stoneridge Drive as opposed to Auto Mall Place, and he stated that there

would be the potential to look at this in the future. He noted that there is an area with a locked gate that separates the two parking lots, and staff could look at the potential future of moving this to better adjust for influx.

Commissioner Pearce inquired how the 10 percent number was arrived at, and Mr. Tassano replied that staff worked with the Sharks to determine what its regional versus local generation was, took trip generation given the proximity of residential units to the location as opposed to Dublin and Livermore and put that into the model, and then they let the model work out where each of those distributions are going to and coming from.

Commissioner O'Connor inquired if there were any contemplation around traffic and type of zonings staff would have if any of the specific uses failed to materialize, for example, if Hendricks or the Sharks decided not to relocate or build. Mr. Tassano replied that the trips the Auto Mall produces for commercial are relatively high, and staff used a retail component with high-generating uses specific to the Auto Mall land. He noted that the trip generations for those uses, with the exception of the CLC, are on the upper end of the uses.

Commissioner Narum referred to the size of the Shark Ice Center facility and the number of people and noted that the EIR talks about reducing it from 1,475; it then talks about a maximum of 999 people in the airport, based on the safety zone it is in. She inquired how this was reconciled to be acceptable.

Ms. Giffin replied that the Airport Land Commission (ALC) has safety zones adopted that are actually immediately east of El Charro Road and that the ice center would be located outside of the Safety Airport Zone. She added that the ALC is also considering revising its safety zones and that staff acknowledges the draft recommended airport safety zones in both the Draft EIR and the Final EIR. She stated that the Draft EIR includes a map of those safety zones as well as a study done in 1996 regarding airport safety, especially over Staples Ranch, which indicated that it is anticipated there may be a crash on the site approximately once every 712 years.

Chair Blank inquired if the Airport Safety Zone is the same as the Airport Protection Area (APA), and Ms. Giffin replied that they are different. She clarified that the Airport Safety Zone is specifically related to crashes, and the APA is more related to nuisance and noise, more of an established line to make sure that residential uses are not located within that boundary.

Chair Blank stated that he thinks that the park is in the APA but that CLC is not. Ms. Giffin confirmed that the residential units would not be located within the APA.

Chair Blank noted that he has seen two plane crashes in that area in a relatively short period of time, and fortunately no one was injured.

Commissioner Narum inquired what would happen if the protection zone was adopted, limiting it to 1,000, before the Sharks facility was actually approved, and if this would affect the EIR. Ms. Giffin replied that so long as the EIR is certified prior to this time, it would not impact the EIR.

Commissioner Pearce moved to recommend to the City Council certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Staples Ranch project as adequate and complete and adoption of the CEQA findings and the Statement of Overriding Considerations for the project.

Commissioner Narum seconded the motion, with the inclusion of a Mitigation Monitoring and Implementation Plan for the project.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Commissioners Blank, Narum, O'Connor, Olson, and Pearce.

NOES: None.

ABSTAIN: None

RECUSED: None.

ABSENT: Commissioners Fox.

Resolutions Nos. PC-2008-49 recommending certification of the Final EIR for the Staples Ranch project as adequate and complete; PC-2008-50 recommending adoption of the CEQA findings and the Statement of Overriding Considerations for the project; and PC-2008-51 recommending approval of the Mitigation Monitoring and Implementation Plan for the project were entered and adopted as motioned.

Commissioner Narum referred to the Draft Stoneridge Drive Specific Plan Amendment for Staples Ranch and questioned some of the wording. She expressed concern that there is no mention of the City's noise ordinance, given the project's proximity to I-580. Ms. Giffin clarified that the noise mitigations are contained within the EIR and that upon approval, the EIR document would go hand-in-hand with the Specific Plan Amendment.

Chair Blank inquired whether or not it should be included, and Commissioner Narum stated that it should be included as there is substantial noise issues from both the airport and the freeway.

Ms. Giffin indicated that it could be added as a policy measure. She added that when the PUD's come forward, they will fall back on a straight-zone district, which automatically includes noise regulations. She noted that the EIR Mitigation Measures are above and beyond those required by the Municipal Code.

Chair Blank expressed concern that five years from now, a developer may come forward and say that the Specific Plan does not say anything about it. He noted that

there has been a lot of discussion about the lead from the airport and the noise from the freeway and the airport.

Commissioner Olson stated that he felt it was reasonable that in comparing the General Plan to the PUD, the PUD has more details that are specific to the project and that this may also apply to a Specific Plan for a specific area. He indicated that he felt this would be picked up in the PUD process.

Mr. Bocian referred to Exception 6 of the Amended Specific Plan, which stipulates there that the EIR is a document related to this Specific Plan, and, therefore, the information in the EIR is part of the Plan.

Commissioner Narum indicated that she did not want to belabor the point, but noted that some of the things listed as specific standards are in the EIR. Mr. Roush stated that it is somewhat broad, but noted that Section 3.11 on page 25 addresses the issue in a general way in that the overall site design of CLC minimizes the exposure of the residents to the I-580 noise, with the purpose of looking at the environmental noise mitigation to flush out the detail, which would be seen in the PUD.

Chair Blank noted that the Plan does not say anything about the airport noise. Ms. Giffin reiteration that this is covered in the EIR.

Chair Blank stated that ten years from now, people could band together and say there is too much noise at the airport. Ms. Giffin noted that on page 32, Land Use Policy, LU.10, it states that all residential structures within the Continuing Care Community are required to be designed to meet single event interior noise levels at specific decibel levels.

Commissioner Narum then referred to page 21, Section 1.3.5, which talks about providing landscaping, including green walls. She inquired what a green wall was in this reference. Ms. Giffin replied that it looks like lattice with vines growing up it, as opposed to green building.

Commissioner Narum referred to Section 1.3.14 and inquired if the auto dealership was okay with prohibiting the use of exterior loud speakers. Ms. Giffin replied that it was.

Commissioner Narum referred to Section 2, Retail and Commercial Site Design Standards, on page 24, and indicated that she did not find any strong wording on trails and bike access, making it bike-friendly.

Chair Blank read Section 2.25, which provides for pedestrian connection points to the extent feasible to trails and pathways.

Commissioner Narum stated that there should be more clarity on this topic, given the Bicycle Master Plan. Commissioner Pearce suggested adding bicycle to pedestrians.

Chair Blank suggested recommending this amendment to the City Council.

Commissioner Pearce moved to recommend approval to the City Council of the Draft Specific Plan Amendment, with the amendment that bicycles be added to pedestrians in Section 2.2.

Commissioner Olson seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Commissioners Blank, Narum, O'Connor, Olson, and Pearce.

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

RECUSED: None.

ABSENT: Commissioner Fox.

Resolution No. PC-2008-52 recommending approval to the City Council of the Draft Specific Plan Amendment, as amended, was entered and adopted as motioned.

Commissioner O'Connor referred to the last sentence of paragraph 10 on page 32: "declare all residential structures within CLC meet single-event interior noise of 50 dBa." He inquired what that contemplated the exterior single-event noise level to be. Ms. Giffin replied that within the EIR, there are contour lines showing what the noise levels are expected to be and that it is approximately 60 dBa for most of the site. She noted that for single event, it is probably closer to use an L-max calculation which this is using, and probably closer to about 80 dBa for a single event, such as an airplane overpassing.

Commissioner O'Connor stated that he had just read in the newspaper that a single-noise event jet noise in Livermore can reach as high as 90 dBa and questioned the accuracy of the data. Ms. Giffin replied that several studies have been done and that one recently revealed lower numbers than what is included in the Draft EIR. She indicated that there is a table in the EIR with this information, as well.

Commissioner O'Connor expressed concerned regarding how the interior could be held to 50 dBa if the exterior single-event noise can get up as high as 90 dBa or higher. Ms. Giffin replied that there are different measurements and that the study done did not go up to 90 dba, but 89.4 dBa. She noted that on page 3.7-11, the noise maximum the City of Pleasanton uses is L-max for single-event noise and up to 80.8 dBa for jets. She indicated that bringing it down to 50 dba is doable.

Chair Blank indicated that the final vote is for the zoning and pre-zoning.

Commissioner Pearce moved to recommend approval to the City Council of the PUD Rezoning and Pre-Zoning for the Staples Ranch project. Commissioner Narum seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

**AYES: Commissioners Blank, Narum, Olson, and Pearce.
NOES: Commissioner O'Connor.
ABSTAIN: None.
RECUSED: None.
ABSENT: Commissioner Fox.**

Resolution No. PC-2008-53 recommending approval of the Rezoning and Pre-Zoning for the Staples Ranch project was entered and adopted as motioned.

Commissioner O'Connor stated that after looking at the most recent documents, he has severe reservations about placing residential so close to the airport, given problems in the past; however, he was supportive of the commercial development.

Chair Blank noted that the residential project was outside the Airport Protection Area (APA).

4. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Blank adjourned the Planning Commission meeting at 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully,

DONNA DECKER
Secretary